

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/5552.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s R. R. Engineering Works, Khansa Road, Laxmi Gardon, Gurgaon.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT FARIDABAD

Reference No. 10 of 1984

*between*

SHRI RAJ KUMAR, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S R. R. ENGINEERING WORKS, KHANSA ROAD, LAXMI GARDON, GURGAON.

Present :

Shri M. P. Tyagi for the workman.

Shri Anil Kumar for the respondent management.

AWARD

This reference has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble the Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/GGN/105/83/2663—68, dated 16th January, 1984, under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Raj Kumar, workman and the respondent management of M/S. R.R.Engineering, Works, Khansa Road, Laxmi Gardon, Gurgaon. The terms of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Raj Kumar was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The representative of the workman has stated that the workman has settled his dispute with the respondent,—*vide* Settlement Ex. M-1, and received Rs 1200 in full and final settlement of his claim. The receipt is Ex. M-2. In view of the compromise, there is no dispute pending between the parties and award is given accordingly.

R. N. SINGAL,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court Faridabad.

Dated the 20th July, 1984.

Endorsement No. 1710, dated 9th August, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,

• Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Faridabad.

No. 9/5/84-6 Lab/5553.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bharat Leather Udyog 18th Mile Stone G. T. Road Nathupur (Sonepat).

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 86 of 1982

*between*

SHRI RAM NARAIN WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BHARAT LEATHER UDYOG 18TH MILE STONE G. T. ROAD NATHUPUR (SONEPAT)

Present :

Shri S. N. Solanki A. R. for the workman.

Shri D. C. Gandhi A. R. for the respondent.

## AWARD

An Industrial Dispute, formulated below, having arisen between the workman Shri Ram Narain and the management of M/s. Bharat Leather Udyog 18th Mile Stone C. T. Road, Nathupur (Sonepat) the Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the same to this Court for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Notification No. ID/SPT/43/82/21657, dated 12th May, 1982 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Narain was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was employed with the respondent as Machineman for the last more than five years and had gone on leave from 20th October, 1981 to 12th November, 1981, but later on he was not allowed resume his duties, so he was prayed for reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service.

The respondent management opposed the claim of the petitioner and in the reply filed by it various pleas were taken. Later on, Shri S. N. Solanki, authorised representative for the workman made a statement that whereabouts of the workman are not known and as such no purpose shall be served in prosecuting the reference any further. So this reference is dismissed for non-prosecution.

Dated, the 20th July, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,

Endst. No. 8682/2731, dated the 5th August, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated, the 20th July, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/5554.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Bhiwani Textile Mills, Bhiwani :—

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 78 of 1981  
between •

SHRI RATI RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. BHIWANI  
TEXTILE MILLS, BHIWANI.

Present :  
Shri S. S. Gupta, A. R. for the workman.  
Shri B. R. Ghaiye, A. R. for the management

## AWARD

An Industrial Dispute, formulated below, having arisen between the workman Shri Rati Ram and the management of M/s. Bhiwani Textile Mills, Bhiwani, the Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the same to this Court for adjudication,—vide Labour Department Notification No. ID/HSR/50/81/26626, dated 26th May, 1981 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rati Ram, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The claim of the workman is that his services were terminated with effect from 5th February, 1981,—vide order, dated 15th January, 1981 on the plea that he has crossed the age of 60 (sixty) years, though he was allowed to remain in service beyond that age and at the time of termination of his services, provisions of section 25-C and 22-F of the Industrial Disputes Act were not adhered to.

In the reply filed by the respondent the claim of the petitioner was vehemently opposed. Later on, when the parties had gone through the gamut of adducing evidence, they made compromise statements alleging settlement. So, I need not details the please taken by the respondent. Since the claim of the petitioner has been fully settled,—*vide* which the petitioner is not claiming reinstatement, so no dispute survives for adjudication. So this reference is answered and returned accordingly. The parties are left to bear their own cost.

Dated, the 20th July, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst. No. 78-81/2732, dated 5th August, 1984

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 20th July, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

No. 9/5/84-6Lab/5561.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Roadways, Sonepat :—

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
ROHTAK

Reference No. 24 of 1982

\* between

SHRI RAJ SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA  
ROADWAYS, SONEPAT

Present :—

Shri S. N. Vats, A. R. for the workman.  
Shri N. C. Jain, L. O. of the management.

#### AWARD

An Industrial Dispute, formulated below, having arisen between the workman Shri Raj Singh, and the management of M/s. Haryana Roadways, Sonepat, the Governor of Haryana in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the same to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Labour Department Notification No. ID/151/81/2502, dated 13th January, 1982 :—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Raj Singh, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The workman alleged that he was in the employment of the respondent since 1st December, 1972, but his services were illegally terminated on 28th April, 1980 and the order of termination is illegal, without jurisdiction and be set aside.

The respondent in the reply filed, took up various pleas, which I need not discuss because after the parties had gone through a protracted trial, they amicably settled the matter,—*vide* which the petitioner was reinstated by the respondent. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, I find that the termination of services of the workman were illegal and since he has been reinstated by the respondent, I need pass no order in that behalf and further hold that the workman shall not be entitled to back wages or continuity of previous service. The reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated, the 21st July, 1984.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst. No. 24-82/2739, dated 5th August, 1984.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Rohtak.